arXiv:1411.4127v3 [quant-ph] 20 Oct 2016

Group theoretical foundations of the Quantum Theory of an interacting particle

Giuseppe Nisticò
Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università della Calabria, Italy
and
INFN – gruppo collegato di Cosenza, Italy
email: gnistico@unical.it

October 21, 2016

Abstract

We point out some obstacles raised by the lost of symmetry against the extension to the case of an interacting particle of the approach that *deductively* establishes the Quantum Theory of a free particle according to the group theoretical methods worked out by Bargmann, Mackey and Wigner. Then we develop an approach which overcomes these difficulties in the non relativistic case. According to our approach the different specific forms of the wave equation of an interacting particle are implied by particular first order invariance properties that characterize the interaction with respect to specific sub-groups of galileian transformations. Moreover, the possibility of yet unknown forms of the wave equation is left open.

1 Introduction

It is well known that group theoretical methods, due in particular to E. Wigner and G. Mackey, allow to attain a formulation of the Quantum Theory of a free particle through a purely deductive development based on symmetry principles. These approaches enforce the circumstance that Galilei's group $\mathcal{G}$ (or Poincaré's group $\mathcal{P}$, for a relativistic theory) is a group of symmetry transformations for an isolated particle, so that Wigner's theorem [1],[2] on the representation of symmetries and Mackey's imprimitivity theorem [3],[4] can be applied to deduce the explicit Quantum Theory of a free particle [5]. In so doing, it is avoided canonical quantization, which invokes a pre-existing *classical theory* of the physical system under investigation and formulates its Quantum Theory by replacing classical magnitudes with operators.

The extension of these group theoretical methods, so satisfactory for a free particle, to an interacting particle encounters serious problems; the main obstacle is the fact that for a non-isolated system the galileian transformations, or the transformations of Poincaré in the relativistic case, do not form a group of symmetry transformations

[6], so that neither Wigner's theorem nor Mackey's imprimitivity theorem can directly apply.

In fact, in the literature several approaches can be found that extend the group theoretical methods to the interacting particle case. However, all these approaches [5],[7],[8],[6], in order to overcome the difficulty raised by the lost of symmetry, have to introduce some assumptions; but, as we argue in section 2.4, these assumptions lead to an empirically non adequate theory, unable, in particular, to describe particles interacting with electromagnetic fields.

In this work we show how a group theoretical approach to the Quantum Theory of an interacting particle can be successfully pursued without introducing assumptions as those required in [5],[7],[8],[6], that too severely restrict the empirical domain of the theory. The present article addresses this task in the non-relativistic case; the development of the approach for a relativistic theory is in progress.

First we find preliminary results which hold both for a non-relativistic and for a relativistic theory, i.e. independently of which group Υ of space-time transformations, $\Upsilon = \mathcal{G}$ or $\Upsilon = \mathcal{P}$, is taken into account. The basic concept (QT) of *quantum transformation* corresponding to a space-time transformation $g \in \Upsilon$, viable also in absence of the condition of symmetry, is introduced in section 2.2 as a transformation S_g^Σ defined on the whole set of quantum observables, which in general depends also on the reference frame Σ. The conditions to be required to this more general notion of quantum transformation are identified in sections 2.2 and 3.1 as three constraints (S.1), (S.2), (S.3). We show in sections 3.1, 3.2 that these conditions, together with a continuity condition for $g \to S_g^\Sigma$, imply that every transformation $g \in \Upsilon$ can be assigned a *unitary* operator U_g, also if the g's are not symmetries, that realizes the quantum transformation of a quantum observable A as $S_g^\Sigma[A] = U_g A U_g^{-1}$, in such a way that the correspondence $g \to U_g$ is a continuous mapping.

But at this point an obstacle stops our development, because the properties (S.1), (S.2), (S.3) are not sufficient to imply that $g \to U_g$ is a *projective representation*, that is one of the conditions required in order that the imprimitivity theorem applies to proceed in the approach.

To address this problem, in section 3.3 we introduce the notion of σ-conversion, which is a straight mathematical procedure that converts each U_g into another unitary operator $\hat{U}_g$ in such a way that $g \to \hat{U}_g$ is a *projective representation*. In the non relativistic case, we prove that the imprimitivity theorem for the *euclidean* group $\mathcal{E}$ – not for the whole galileian group $\mathcal{G}$ – can be applied to explicitly identify a mathematical formalism of the theory; but in general the position operators are not explicitly identified, so that the identified formalism turns out to be devoid of physical significance.

In order to attain an effective theory it is necessary to determine which operators represent position and to determine the dynamical law. In section 3.4 we show how the operators that *physically* represent the position of the particle are explicitly represented for a particular class of interactions, completely characterized by admitting "Q-covariant" σ-conversions, i.e. σ-conversions that leaves unaltered the covariance properties of the position with respect to $\mathcal{G}$. For this class of interactions the general dynamical law is determined in section 3.5.

This general dynamical law does not specify the explicit form of the hamiltonian operator H; in fact, different specific forms of the wave equation are compatible with this general law. Then we face the problem of singling out conditions related to the

interaction, which determine the different specific wave equations.

In section 4 we identify these conditions as *invariance properties related to the interaction*. More precisely, we single out which *specific forms the wave equation takes* if the σ-conversion admitted by the interaction leaves unaltered, at the first order, the covariance properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$, namely of position at time t, *with respect to specific sub-groups of* $\mathcal{G}$. In so doing, the known wave equations are recovered, but also yet unknown ones could be singled out. In the conclusive section 4.4 the relation of the present approach with other methods for quantizing the interaction are briefly discussed.

2 Space-time and quantum transformations

In this section, once introduced some necessary mathematics, we establish the concepts that enforce the work and formulate them in the quantum formalism. In section 2.2 we introduce a concept of *quantum transformation*, corresponding to Galilei's or Poincaré's transformations, that is viable also in the case that the system is an *interacting* system, i.e., when the transformations are not symmetries. A general property (S.1) of these quantum transformations, conceptually entailed by their very meaning, is identified. The presence of the *symmetry* character of the transformations implies stronger properties; they are established in section 2.3, where we outline how the further properties can be used to obtain the explicit Quantum Theory of a free particle by mathematically deducing it form the symmetry principles. This outline allow us to identify, in sections 2.4, the obstacles raised by the lost of the symmetry condition against a similar deduction in the case of an interacting particle.

2.1 Mathematical tools

Let us introduce, to begin, the notation for the mathematical structures involved in the work. The Quantum Theory of a physical system, formulated in a complex and separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, needs the following mathematical structures.

- The set $\Omega(\mathcal{H})$ of all self-adjoint operators of $\mathcal{H}$, which represent *quantum observables*.
- The complete, ortho-complemented lattice $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$ of all projections operators of $\mathcal{H}$, i.e. quantum observables with possible outcomes in $\{0, 1\}$.
- The set $\Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$ of all rank one orthogonal projections of $\mathcal{H}$.
- The set $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ of all density operators of $\mathcal{H}$, which represent *quantum states*.
- The set $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ of all unitary operators of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

In the group theoretical approach a key role is played by the *imprimitivity theorem* of Mackey, which is a representation theorem for *imprimitivity* systems relative to projective representations [4]. The following definition recalls the notion of projective representation.

Definition 2.1. *Let G be a separable, locally compact group with identity element e. A correspondence $U : G \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$, $g \to U_g$, with $U_e = \mathbb{1}$, is a projective representation of G if the following conditions hold.*

i) *A complex function* $\sigma : G \times G \to \mathbb{C}$*, called multiplier, exists such that* $U_{g_1 g_2} = \sigma(g_1, g_2) U_{g_1} U_{g_2}$*;*

ii) *for all* $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}$*, the mapping* $g \to \langle U_g \phi \mid \psi \rangle$ *is a Borel function in* g*.*

A projective representation with multiplier σ *is also called* σ*-representation.*

A projective representation is said to be continuous if for any fixed $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ *the mapping* $g \to U_g \psi$ *from* G *to* $\mathcal{H}$ *is continuous with respect to* g*.*

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the Euclidean group, i.e. the semi-direct product $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}^3 \circledS SO(3)$ between the group of spatial translations $\mathbb{R}^3$ and the group of spatial proper rotations $SO(3)$; each transformation $g \in \mathcal{E}$ bi-univocally corresponds to the pair $(\mathbf{a}, R) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times SO(3)$ such that $R^{-1}\mathbf{x} - R^{-1}\mathbf{a} \equiv \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ is the result of the passive transformation of the spatial point $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ by g. The general imprimitivity theorem is an advanced mathematical result [**?**]; in this article we shall make use of this theorem relatively to the euclidean group $\mathcal{E}$ only. Then we introduce the concept of *imprimitivity system* and the theorem for this specific case [**?**],[**?**].

Definition 2.2. *Let* $\mathcal{H}$ *be the Hilbert space of a* σ*-representation* $g \to U_g$ *of the Euclidean group* $\mathcal{E}$*. A projection valued (PV) measure* $E : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^3) \to \Pi(\mathcal{H})$*,* $\Delta \to E(\Delta)$ *is an imprimitivity system for the* σ*-representation* $g \to U_g$ *if the relation*

$$U_g E(\Delta) U_g^{-1} = E(\mathbf{g}^{-1}(\Delta)) \equiv E(R(\Delta) + \mathbf{a}) \tag{1}$$

holds for all $(\mathbf{a}, R) \in \mathcal{E}$*.*

Mackey's theorem of imprimitivity for $\mathcal{E}$**.** *If a PV measure* $E : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^3) \to \Pi(\mathcal{H})$ *is an imprimitivity system for a continuous* σ*-representation* $g \to U_g$ *of the Euclidean group* $\mathcal{E}$*, then a* σ*-representation* $L : SO(3) \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ *exists such that, modulo a unitary isomorphism,*

(M.1) $\mathcal{H} = L_2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}_0)$*,*

(M.2) $(E(\Delta)\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = \chi_\Delta(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x})$*, where* χ_Δ *is the characteristic functional of* Δ*,*

(M.3) $(U_g\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = L_R \psi(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})) \equiv L_R \psi(R^{-1}\mathbf{x} - R^{-1}\mathbf{a})$*, for every* $g = (\mathbf{a}, R) \in \mathcal{E}$*.*

Furthermore, the σ*-representation* U *is irreducible if and only if the "inducing" representation* L *is irreducible.*

2.2 Basic concepts

In this subsection we formulate a concept of quantum transformation, which is viable also for space-time transformations that are not symmetry transformations.

For sake of synthesis, in the following by Υ we denote the group $\mathcal{G}$ of galileian transformations without time translations and space-time inversions, or the group $\mathcal{P}$ of Poincaré's transformations without space-time inversions; therefore, what stated for Υ must be understood stated for $\mathcal{G}$ and also for $\mathcal{P}$. In the present work the group Υ is interpreted as a group of changes of reference frame in a class $\mathcal{F}$ of frames which move uniformly with respect to each other. So, given any reference frame Σ in $\mathcal{F}$, a transformation $g \in \Upsilon$ univocally singles out the reference frame Σ_g related to Σ just by g.

Let us consider the Quantum Theory of a *localizable particle*, that is to say of a physical system which can be localized in a point of the physical space, so that its

Quantum Theory contains a unique triple $(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3) \equiv \mathbf{Q}$ of commuting self-adjoint operators representing the three coordinates of the position. Now, the point of the space, where the particle is localized by the measurement of the position observables, is identified only if the frame is specified the values of the coordinates refer to. For instance, if $(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3) \equiv \mathbf{Q}$ are the three self-adjoint operators which represent the three coordinates of the position with respect to Σ and if $g \in \mathcal{E}$, then the α-th coordinate of the position with respect to another frame Σ_g, related to Σ by g, must be represented by $[\mathsf{g}(\mathbf{Q})]_\alpha$, where $\mathsf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = (y_1, y_2, y_3)$ is the triple of the coordinates, with respect to Σ_g, of the spatial point represented by $\mathbf{x}$ with respect to Σ. In the non relativistic case, a pure galileian boost $g \in \mathcal{G}$ characterized by a velocity $\mathbf{u} = (u, 0, 0)$, does not change the instantaneous position at all; hence $\mathsf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ and $S_g^\Sigma[\mathbf{Q}] = \mathsf{g}(\mathbf{Q}) = \mathbf{Q}$, so that the operators which represent the coordinates of the "position with respect to Σ_g" coincide with the operators representing the position coordinates with respect to Σ. In order to transform the position quantum observables at time t, i.e. the operators $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)} = e^{iHt}\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}e^{-iHt}$, by a galileian boost g, a function g_t different from g must be used. Indeed, $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ represents the position measured with a delay t, therefore the operators which represent the "position at time t with respect to Σ_g" must be $S_g^\Sigma[\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}] = (Q_1^{(t)} - ut, Q_2, Q_3) \equiv \mathsf{g}_t(\mathbf{Q}^{(t)})$, where $\mathsf{g}_t(\mathbf{x}) = (x_1 - ut, x_2, x_3)$

In general, we can state that for every $g \in \mathcal{G}$ the following covariance relations hold for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$(i) \quad S_g^\Sigma[\mathbf{Q}] = \mathsf{g}(\mathbf{Q}), \qquad (ii) \quad S_g^\Sigma[\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}] = \mathsf{g}_t(\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}), \tag{2}$$

where g_t is a suitable function, in general different from g. In fact, relations (2) are the conditions which *define* the position operators of a localizable particle.

A priori we cannot exclude that also observables other than position change their representation according to the frame they are referred to; so, in order that the Quantum Theory of our particle can account for such a possibility, it must appropriately extend the transformations S_g^Σ to all quantum observables. To this aim, given two reference frames Σ_1 and Σ_2 in $\mathcal{F}$, we introduce the following concept of *relative indistinguishability* between measuring procedures:

If a measuring procedure $\mathcal{M}_1$ is relatively to Σ_1 identical to what is $\mathcal{M}_2$ relatively to Σ_2, we say that $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ are indistinguishable relatively to (Σ_1, Σ_2).

Then, for every $g \in \Upsilon$ and every Σ in $\mathcal{F}$ we introduce the mapping

$$S_g^\Sigma : \Omega(\mathcal{H}) \to \Omega(\mathcal{H}), \quad A \to S_g^\Sigma[A] \tag{3}$$

with the following conceptually explicit interpretation.

(QT) *The self-adjoint operators A and $S_g^\Sigma[A]$ represent two measuring procedures $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ indistinguishable relatively to (Σ, Σ_g).*

For instance, if A represents a detector placed in the origin of Σ with a given orientation relative to Σ, then $S_g^\Sigma[A]$ is the operator that represents an identical detector placed in the origin of Σ_g with that orientation relative to Σ_g. It must be noticed that (QT) presupposes that for each quantum observable $A \in \Omega(\mathcal{H})$ and every $g \in \Upsilon$, two measuring procedures with the required relative indistinguishability exist, at least in principle.

We call S_g^Σ the *quantum transformation* corresponding to g.

Relations (2) explicitly specify the action of the transformations S_g^Σ on the position operators $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$; for an arbitrary observable no such a kind of explicit specification can be *a priori* established. However, the authentic meaning (QT) of the notion of quantum transformation is sufficient to infer, at a conceptual level, the following general constraint.

(S.1) *For every frame Σ in $\mathcal{F}$ the following statement holds.*

$$S_{gh}^\Sigma[A] = S_g^{\Sigma_h}\left[S_h^\Sigma[A]\right], \text{ for all } A \in \Omega(\mathcal{H}). \tag{4}$$

This statement stresses how in general, i.e. without further particular conditions, the mapping S_g^Σ, with g fixed, can change by changing the "starting" frame Σ.

2.3 Symmetry transformations

Let us now briefly outline the particular stronger implications of the existence of conditions of symmetry. A transformation $h \in \Upsilon$ is a symmetry transformation for the physical system under investigation if a class $\mathcal{F}$ exists such that for every frame Σ in $\mathcal{F}$, the frames Σ and Σ_h are equivalent for the formulation of the empirical theory of the system; for an isolated system, all $g \in \Upsilon$ are symmetry transformations.

The symmetry property allows to apply Wigner's theorem, and in so doing the following well known implication is obtained [1],[2],[9],[10].

SYM.1. *If $g \in \Upsilon$ is a symmetry transformation then a unitary or an anti-unitary operator U_g^Σ, unique up a phase factor, exists such that*

$$S_g^\Sigma[A] = U_g^\Sigma A \left[U_g^\Sigma\right]^*. \tag{5}$$

Moreover, according to the Principle of Relativity, for an isolated system all $g \in \Upsilon$ are symmetry transformations. Therefore, a class $\mathcal{F}$ exists such that the following statement holds.

SYM.2. *In the Quantum Theory of an isolated system, for each $g \in \Upsilon$ the quantum transformation S_g^Σ must be independent of Σ, i.e. $S_g^\Sigma = S_g^{\Sigma_h} \equiv S_g$ and $U_g^\Sigma = e^{i\lambda} U_g^{\Sigma_h}$ (with $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$), so that (4) and (5) imply*

$$S_{gh}[A] = S_g\left[S_h[A]\right]. \tag{6}$$

Therefore, $U_{gh} = \sigma(g,h) U_g U_h$ holds, which implies that each U_g is unitary [5],[9]; in particular, $U_g^* = U_g^{-1}$. Thus, if Υ is a group of symmetry transformations, the correspondence $g \to U_g$ such that $S_g[A] = U_g A U_g^*$ is a projective representation [4],[5],[11].

A *free localizable particle* is just a particular kind of isolated system, so that according to SYM.2 for every $g \in \Upsilon$ a unitary operator U_g exists such that $S_g[A] = U_g A U_g^{-1}$. The restriction of $g \to U_g$ to the euclidean group $\mathcal{E}$ is a projective representation of $\mathcal{E}$ [5]. Then, according to (2) and SYM.1, the relation $U_g \mathbf{Q} U_g^{-1} = \mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{Q})$ holds; it entails that the common spectral PV spectral measure of $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1, Q_2, Q_3)$ is an imprimitivity system for $U \mid_{\mathcal{E}}$ [5]; therefore we can apply Mackey's imprimitivity theorem. In so doing, to each choice of the inducing representation $L : SO(3) \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ in Mackey's theorem and of μ in (9), there corresponds a different theory. Accordingly,

the Hilbert space of the theory can be identified as $L_2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}_0)$, and the position operators as $(Q_\alpha \psi)(\mathbf{x}) = x_\alpha \psi(\mathbf{x})$. Furthermore, in a non-relativistic theory, by making use of Galileian invariance, valid for a free particle, it can be proved [5],[12] that the form of the hamiltonian operator must be $H = -\frac{1}{2\mu} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_\alpha^2}$. By choosing L as an irreducible σ-representation of $SO(3)$ of dimension $2s+1$ ($s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$), the Standard Quantum Theory of a spin-s free particle is obtained.

2.4 The interacting particle problem

If the system under investigation is not isolated, e.g. if it is an *interacting* particle, then neither SYM.1 nor SYM.2 apply, so that we find an obstacle in extending the group theoretical approach to the non-relativistic interacting particle. However, in the literature several proposals can be found [5],[7],[8],[6] where the group theoretical methods are extended to the interacting case. Each proposal overcomes the aforesaid obstacles, in the non-relativistic case, by introducing particular assumptions we reformulate into the following statement.

PROJ. *Each galileian transformation g is represented in the formalism of the Quantum Theory by a unitary operator U_g in such a way that*

i) $S_g^{\Sigma}[\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}] = U_g \mathbf{Q}^{(t)} U_g^{-1}$ *is the quantum transformation of the "position at time t" observables corresponding to g;*

ii) *the correspondence $g \to U_g$ is a continuous projective representation.*

Statement PROJ is introduced as an assumption in [5], page 201; the conditions assumed in [7] by Jauch, page 236, are implied by PROJ; Ekstein, instead, essentially derives it from another assumption, namely from the "empirical statement that it is possible to give an operational definition of any initial state intrinsically", i.e. independently of the presence or absence of the interaction (cfr. [6], page 1401).

By making use of PROJ, some of the cited approaches [5],[7] deduce that in the non-relativistic Quantum Theory of a spin-0 particle, undergoing an interaction homogeneous in time, the hamiltonian operator H must have the following form, able to describe also interactions of electromagnetic kind [5],[7].

$$H = \frac{1}{2\mu} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} \left(-i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha} + a_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{x}). \tag{7}$$

Now we shall prove, instead, the following statement.

STAT. *Assumption* PROJ *implies that the hamiltonian of the Quantum Theory of a spin-0 particle undergoing an interaction homogeneous in time must have the form*

$$H = \frac{1}{2\mu} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} \left(-i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha} \right)^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{x}).$$

To prove the sentence STAT we shall make use of the following well known results.

MP.1. As an important implication of Wigner's theorem, the general evolution law of quantum observables with respect to a homogeneous time is obtained [9]: a self-adjoint operator H exists, called hamiltonian operator, such that

$$A^{(t)} = e^{iHt} A e^{-iHt} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{dt} A^{(t)} \equiv \dot{A}^{(t)} = i[H, A^{(t)}]. \tag{8}$$

MP.2. Let $g \to \hat{U}_g$ be every continuous non trivial projective representation of Galilei's group $\mathcal{G}$, i.e. the group generated by the euclidean group $\mathcal{E}$ and by galileian velocity boosts. Now, the nine one-parameter abelian sub-groups $\mathcal{T}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ of spatial translation, spatial rotations and galileian velocity boosts, relative to axis x_α, are all additive; then, according to Stone's theorem [9], there exist nine self-adjoint generators $\hat{P}_\alpha$, $\hat{J}_\alpha$, $\hat{G}_\alpha$ of the nine one-parameter unitary subgroups $\{e^{-i\hat{P}_\alpha a_\alpha}, a \in \mathbb{R}\}$, $\{e^{-i\hat{J}_\alpha \theta_\alpha}, \theta_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$, $\{e^{-i\hat{G}_\alpha u_\alpha}, u_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$ that represent the sub-groups $\mathcal{T}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ according to the projective representation $g \to \hat{U}_g$ of the Galilei's group $\mathcal{G}$. The structural properties of $\mathcal{G}$ as a Lie group imply the following commutation relations [13].

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{(i) } [\hat{P}_\alpha, \hat{P}_\beta] = \mathbb{0}, \quad \text{(ii) } [\hat{J}_\alpha, \hat{P}_\beta] = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\hat{P}_\gamma, \quad \text{(iii) } [\hat{J}_\alpha, \hat{J}_\beta] = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\hat{J}_\gamma,\\ &\text{(iv) } [\hat{J}_\alpha, \hat{G}_\beta] = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\hat{G}_\gamma, \quad \text{(v) } [\hat{G}_\alpha, \hat{G}_\beta] = \mathbb{0}, \quad \text{(vi) } [\hat{G}_\alpha, \hat{P}_\beta] = i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\mu\mathbb{1},\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ is the Levi-Civita symbol $\epsilon_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ restricted by the condition $\alpha \neq \gamma \neq \beta$, and μ is a non-zero real number which characterizes the projective representation.

Proof of Stat. Now we explicitly prove Stat. Since $g \to U_g$ in Proj is a projective representation, according to (**MP.2**) the sub-groups $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$, $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$, $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ can be represented by the one-parameter unitary sub-groups $\{e^{-iP_\alpha a}\}_{a\in\mathbb{R}}$, $\{e^{-iJ_\alpha\theta}\}_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}}$, $\{e^{iG_\alpha u}\}_{u\in\mathbb{R}}$, in such a way that the self-adjoint generators $P_\alpha, J_\alpha, G_\alpha$ satisfy (9). Once defined the self-adjoint operators $F_\alpha = \frac{G_\alpha}{\mu}$, it can be proved that relations (9) imply that the following relation holds for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$.

$$U_g \mathbf{F} U_g^{-1} = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{F}). \tag{10}$$

Since by (9.v) the F_α's commute with each other, according to spectral theory, a unique PV measure $E : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^3) \to \Pi(\mathcal{H})$ exists such that $F_\alpha = \int \lambda dE^{(\alpha)}_\lambda$, where $E^{(1)}_\lambda = E((-\infty, \lambda] \times \mathbb{R}^2)$, $E^{(2)}_\lambda = E(\mathbb{R} \times (-\infty, \lambda] \times \mathbb{R})$, $E^{(3)}_\lambda = E(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \lambda])$. Then (10) easily implies that $\Delta \to E(\Delta)$ satisfies (1) and hence it is an *imprimitivity* system for the *restriction* to $\mathcal{E}$ of $g \to U_g$; therefore Mackey's theorem applies. In so doing, the simplest choice for $\mathcal{H}_0$, i.e. $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{C}$, leads to identify $\mathcal{H}$, F_α, P_α, and U_g for $g \in \mathcal{E}$ as

$$\mathcal{H} = L_2(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad (F_\alpha\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = x_\alpha\psi(\mathbf{x}), \quad P_\alpha = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha}, \quad (U_g\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = \psi\left(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\right). \tag{11}$$

Now we can easily prove that the position operators $\mathbf{Q}$ coincide with $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{G}/\mu$.

Proposition 2.1. *If* Proj *holds, then in the simplest Quantum Theory of a localizable interacting particle the equality* $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{Q}$ *holds for the position operators satisfying the covariance properties (2).*

Proof. If $g \in \mathcal{T}_\beta$ and Proj holds, so that by (**MP.2**) $U_g = e^{-iP_\beta a}$, then (2.i) implies $[Q_\alpha, P_\beta] = i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{1}$; since $[F_\alpha, P_\beta] = i\delta_{\alpha,\beta}\mathbb{1}$ is implied by (9.iv), also $[F_\alpha - Q_\alpha, P_\beta] = \mathbb{0}$ holds. On the other hand (2.i) for $U_g = e^{iG_\beta u}$ implies $[F_\alpha - Q_\alpha, F_\beta] = \mathbb{0}$, and hence $F_\alpha - Q_\alpha = c_\alpha\mathbb{1} \equiv$constant must hold for the irreducibility of $(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P})$. Finally, Proj.i together with (9.iv) and (2.i) for $U_g = e^{-iJ_\alpha\theta}$ imply $[J_\alpha, F_\beta - Q_\beta] = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(F_\gamma - Q_\gamma) = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}c_\gamma\mathbb{1} = [J_\alpha, c_\beta\mathbb{1}] = \mathbb{0}$; thus, $F_\alpha - Q_\alpha = \mathbb{0}$. •

Prop. 2.1 together with (2.ii) is sufficient to determine the form of the hamiltonian operator H consistent with Proj. First, we determine $[G_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta]$. Let us start with

$$e^{iG_\alpha u}\dot{Q}_\beta e^{-iG_\alpha u} = \dot{Q}_\beta + i[G_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta]u + o(u), \tag{12}$$

where $o(u)$ is an infinitesimal operator of order greater than 1 with respect to u. By making use of $\dot{Q}_\beta = i[H, Q_\beta] = \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{Q^{(t)}_\beta - Q_\beta}{t}$, and of $e^{iG_\alpha u} Q^{(t)}_\beta e^{-iG_\alpha u} = Q^{(t)}_\beta - \delta_{\alpha\beta} ut\mathbb{I}$, implied by (2.ii), we also find

$$e^{iG_\alpha u}\dot{Q}_\beta e^{-iG_\alpha u} = \lim_{t\to 0} e^{iG_\alpha u}\frac{Q^{(t)}_\beta - Q_\beta}{t}e^{-iG_\alpha u} = \dot{Q}_\beta - \delta_{\alpha\beta} u\mathbb{I}. \tag{13}$$

The comparison between (12) and (13), and Prop. 2.1 yield

$$[G_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta] = [Q_\alpha, \mu\dot{Q}_\beta] = i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{I}, \text{ which implies } [F_\alpha, \mu\dot{Q}_\beta - P_\beta] = \mathbb{O}. \tag{14}.$$

This argument can be repeated with $U_g = e^{-iP_\alpha a}$ instead of $e^{iG_\alpha u}$, and also with $U_g = e^{-iJ_\alpha\theta}$ instead of $e^{iG_\alpha u}$. In so doing we obtain, respectively, $[P_\alpha, \mu\dot{Q}_\beta - P_\beta] = \mathbb{O}$ and $[J_\alpha, \mu\dot{Q}_\beta] = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}\mu\dot{Q}_\gamma$; the first of these two equations, together with (14), implies $\mu\dot{Q}_\beta - P_\beta = b_\beta\mathbb{I}$; then, by making use of the second equation, we obtain $i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\mu\dot{Q}_\gamma - P_\gamma) = [J_\alpha, \mu\dot{Q}_\beta - P_\beta] = [J_\alpha, b_\beta\mathbb{I}] = \mathbb{O}$, i.e. $\mu\dot{Q}_\beta = P_\beta$.

At this point the determination of H is straightforward. From (9.vi) we obtain

$$i[H, Q_\beta] = \dot{Q}_\beta = \frac{1}{\mu}P_\beta = i\left[\frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\gamma P^2_\gamma, \frac{G_\beta}{\mu}\right] \equiv i\left[\frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\gamma P^2_\gamma, Q_\beta\right]. \tag{15}$$

Then the completeness of $\mathbf{Q}$ implies that the operator $H - \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\gamma P^2_\gamma$ is a function Φ of $\mathbf{Q}$. Thus

$$H = -\frac{1}{2\mu}\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2_1} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2_2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2_3}\right) + \Phi(\mathbf{Q}). \tag{16}$$

Thus, assumption PROJ forbids the description of electromagnetic interactions, because their physics is correctly described by the hamiltonian in (7), inequivalent to (16).

3 Quantum Theory of an interacting particle

Coherently with the conclusion of the last section, in order to develop a Quantum Theory of a particle able to describe also electromagnetic interactions, assumption PROJ must be abandoned. In this section we undertake such a development, under the hypothesis that the interaction does not destroy time homogeneity, so that according to (**MP.1**) an hamiltonian operator H exists such that (8) holds

We begin by identifying two further properties (S.2) and (S.3) of quantum transformations, which add to the general property (S.1) already established.

(S.2) For every $g \in \Upsilon$, the mapping S^Σ_g is bijective.

(S.3) For every real Borel function f such that if A is a self-adjoint operator, then $B = f(A)$ is a self-adjoint operator too, the following equality holds:

$$f(S^\Sigma_g[A]) = S^\Sigma_g[f(A)]. \tag{17}$$

In fact, these further properties are directly implied on a conceptual ground by the meaning of quantum transformation expressed by (QT). For instance, with regard to (S.3), one can argue as follows. Let f be any fixed real Borel function such that

if A is a self-adjoint operator, then $B = f(A)$ is a self-adjoint operator too. Now, according to Quantum Theory a measurement of the quantum observable $f(A)$ can be performed by measuring A and then transforming the obtained outcome a by the purely mathematical function f into the outcome $b = f(a)$ of $f(A)$. If a measurement procedure is relatively to Σ identical to another measuring procedure relatively to Σ_g, then transforming the outcomes of both procedures by means of the same function f should not affect the relative indistinguishability of the so modified procedures. So we should conclude that (17) holds.

Hence, the concept (QT) entails the validity of (S.2) and (S.3); for reasons we shall indicate later in remark 3.1, however, for the time being we formulate them as conditions which characterize a class of interactions.

In sections 3.1, 3.2 we show that the further properties (S.2), (S.3) imply that if the correspondence $g \to S_g^\Sigma$ is continuous according to the metric adopted by Bargmann [11], then for every $g \in \Upsilon$ a *unitary* operator U_g must exists such that

i) $g \to U_g$ is continuous;

ii) $S_g^\Sigma[A] = U_g A U_g^{-1}$.

This result addresses one of the obstacles against the extension of the group theoretical approach to an interacting particle; but other obstacles remain. Indeed, in order to explicitly identify the mathematical formalism of the theory we should apply the imprimitivity theorem; but this is not possible because, while the mapping $g \to U_g$ is continuous under a condition of continuity for $g \to S_g^\Sigma$, it is not a projective representation, and such a projectivity condition is required by the imprimitivity theorem.

To address this new obstacle we shall introduce in section 3.3 the notion of "σ-conversion", which is a consistent mathematical process carrying out the conversion of the mapping $U : \Upsilon \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$, $g \to U_g$ into a mapping $\hat{U} : \Upsilon \to \hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathcal{H})$, $g \to \hat{U}_g$ which is a projectiove representation.

Using σ-conversions shall allow the approach to proceed. In the non-relativistic case, where $\Upsilon = \mathcal{G}$, we prove that the postion operators $\mathbf{Q}$ coincide with the multiplication operators endowed with the usual interpretation if and only if the interaction admits "Q-covariant" σ-conversions, i.e. σ-conversions that leave unaltered the covariance properties of the position operators $\mathbf{Q}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$. For Q-covariant σ-conversions we derive a general dynamical equation (27), in section 3.4.

3.1 General implications for quantum transformations

Conditions (S.2) and (S.3), are sufficient to show further properties of the mappings S_g^Σ, according to the following Prop.s 3.1 and 3.2.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $S : \Omega(\mathcal{H}) \to \Omega(\mathcal{H})$ be a bijective mapping such that $S[f(A)] = f(S[A])$ for every Borel real function f such that $f(A) \in \Omega(\mathcal{H})$ if $A \in \Omega(\mathcal{H})$. Then the following statements hold.*

i) *If $E \in \Pi(\mathcal{H})$ then $S[E] \in \Pi[\mathcal{H}]$, i.e., the mapping S is an extension of a bijection of $\Pi(\mathcal{H}]$.*

ii) *If $A, B \in \Omega(\mathcal{H})$ and $A+B \in \Omega(\mathcal{H})$, then $[A, B] = \mathbb{0}$ implies $S[A+B] = S[A]+S[B]$. This partial additivity immediately implies $S[A] = \mathbb{0}$ if and only if $A = \mathbb{0}$.*

iii) *For all $E, F \in \Pi(\mathcal{H})$, $EF = \mathbb{0}$ implies $S[E + F] = S[E] + S[F] \in \Pi(\mathcal{H})$; as a consequence, $E \leq F$ if and only if $S[E] \leq S[F]$.*

iv) $S[P] \in \Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$ *if and only if* $P \in \Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. (i) If $E \in \Pi(\mathcal{H})$ and $f(\lambda) = \lambda^2$ then $f(E) = E$ holds; so $S[f(E)] = f(S[E])$ implies $(S_g[E])^2 \equiv f(S[E]) = S[E^2] \equiv S[E]$, i.e. $S^2[E] = S[E]$.

(ii) If $[A, B] = \mathbb{0}$ then a self-adjoint operator C and two functions f_a, f_b exist so that $A = f_a(C)$ and $B = f_b(C)$; once defined the function $f = f_a + f_b$, we have $S[A+B] \equiv S[f(C)] = f(S[C]) = f_a(S[C]) + f_b(S[C]) = S[f_a(C)] + S[f_b(C)] \equiv S[A] + S[C]$.

(iii) If $EF = \mathbb{0}$, then $[E, F] = \mathbb{0}$ and $(E + F) \in \Pi(\mathcal{H})$ hold. Statements (i) and (ii) imply $S[E + F] = S[E] + S[F] \in \Pi(\mathcal{H})$.

(iv) If $P \in \Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$ then $S[P] \in \Pi(\mathcal{H})$ by (i). If $Q \in \Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $Q \leq S[P]$ then $P_0 \equiv S^{-1}[Q] \leq P$ by (iii); but P is rank 1, therefore $P_0 = P$ and $Q = S[P]$. •

Corollary 3.1. *From Prop.3.1 immediately follows that the restriction of* S *to* $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$ *is a bijection that also satisfies* $S[\mathbb{0}] = \mathbb{0}$, $S[\mathbb{1}] = \mathbb{1}$, $E \leq F$ *iff* $S[E] \leq S[F]$, $S[E^\perp] = (S[E])^\perp$.

In the literature different equivalent formulations of Wigner's theorem [2],[14] have been proved. The following version shall find application for the the mapping S of Prop. 3.1.

Wigner's theorem. *If* $S : \Pi(\mathcal{H}) \to \Pi(\mathcal{H})$ *is an automorphism of* $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$, *i.e. if it is a bijective mapping such that*

$$E_1 \leq E_2 \Leftrightarrow S[E_1] \leq S[E_2] \quad \textit{and} \quad S[E^\perp] = (S[E])^\perp, \quad \forall E_1, E_2, E \in \Pi(\mathcal{H}),$$

then either a unitary operator or an anti-unitary operator U *of* $\mathcal{H}$ *exists such that* $S(E) = UEU^*$ *for all* $E \in \Pi(\mathcal{H})$, *unique up a phase factor.*

In virtue of Corollary 3.1 and of Wigner's theorem, the following proposition is easily proved.

Proposition 3.2. *If a mapping* S *satisfies the hypothesis of Prop. 3.1, then a unitary or an anti-unitary operator exists such that* $S[A] = UAU^*$ *for every* $A \in \Omega(\mathcal{H})$*; if another unitary or anti-unitary operator* V *satisfies* $S[A] = VAV^*$ *for every* $A \in \Omega(\mathcal{H})$, *then* $V = e^{i\theta}U$ *with* $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Prop.s 3.1 and 3.2 are proved for a mapping $S : \Omega(\mathcal{H}) \to \Omega(\mathcal{H})$; therefore they hold for every quantum transformation S_g^Σ of the Quantum Theory of a particle whose interaction is in the class for which (S.2), (S.3) hold. Then, for each $g \in \Upsilon$, according to Prop. 3.2 each transformation $g \in \Upsilon$ is assigned a unitary or an anti unitary operator U_g which realizes the corresponding quantum transformation as the automorphism $S_g^\Sigma : \Pi(\mathcal{H}) \to \Pi(\mathcal{H})$, $S_g^\Sigma[A] = U_g A U_g^*$, also if g is not a symmetry transformation.

3.2 Continuity and unitarity of $g \to U_g$

Given $g \in \Upsilon$, the unitary or anti-unitary operator U_g such that $S_g^\Sigma[A] = U_g A U_g^*$ can be arbitrarily chosen within an equivalence class $\mathbf{U}_g$ of operators, all unitary or all anti-unitary, which differ from each other by a complex phase factor; this class $\mathbf{U}_g$ is called *operator ray* [11]; due to Wigner's theorem, there is a bijective correspondence between operator rays and automorphisms of $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$. The possibility that the choice of U_g within $\mathbf{U}_g$ makes the correspondence $g \to U_g$ continuous has a decisive role in developing the Quantum Theory of a physical system; for instance, for the non-relativistic

Quantum Theory of a free particle, it makes possible Stone's theorem to apply, and as a consequence the one-parameter sub-groups $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$, $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$, $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ can be represented as $e^{-iP_\alpha a}$, $e^{-iJ_\alpha \theta}$, $e^{iG_\alpha u}$. According to results due to Bargmann [11], a choice of U_g in $\mathbf{U}_g$ leading to a continuous correspondence $g \to U_g$ exists if the mapping $g \to S_g^\Sigma$ is *continuous*, where $S_g^\Sigma : \Pi(\mathcal{H}) \to \Pi(\mathcal{H})$ is the restriction to $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$ of the quantum transformation corresponding to g. However, Bargmann carried out his proof by requiring that *all operators U_g are unitary*. Now we see how the implication proved by Bargmann holds also if such a restriction is removed.

The continuity notion of Bargmann[1] for $g \to S_g^\Sigma$ is based on the following metric of $\Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$.

Definition 3.1. *Given two rank 1 projection operators $D_1, D_2 \in \Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$, the distance $d(D_1, D_2)$ is the minimal distance $\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|$ between vectors ψ_1, ψ_2 such that $P_1 = |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1|$ and $P_2 = |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|$, i.e., $d(D_1, D_2) = [2(1 - |\langle\psi_1 \mid \psi_2\rangle|]^{1/2}$.*

Then, following Bargmann, the continuity of a mapping from a topological group G to the automorphisms of $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$, is defined as follows.

Definition 3.2. *A correspondence $g \to S_g$ from a topological group G to the set of all automorphisms of $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be continuous if for any fixed $D \in \Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$ the mapping from G to $\Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$, $g \to S_g[D]$ is continuous in g with respect to the distance d defined on $\Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$ by Def. 3.1.*

Before proving the main result Prop.3.3, we formulate three lemmas. The first one, Lemma 3.1, was proved by Bargmann as Lemma 1.1 in [11].

Lemma 3.1. *The real function $\kappa : \Pi_1(\mathcal{H}) \times \Pi_1(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$, $\kappa(D_1, D_2) = Tr(D_1 D_2)$ is continuous in both variables D_1 and D_2 with respect to the metric of Def. 3.1.*

Lemma 3.2. *Given a topological group G and a mapping $g \to S_g$ from G to the automorphisms of $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$, for every $g \in G$ let $\mathbf{U}_g$ denote the operator ray identified by S_g; for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|\varphi\| = 1$, let us define*

$$z_{h,g}(\varphi) = U_g\varphi - \langle U_h\varphi \mid U_g\varphi\rangle U_h\varphi,$$

where $h, g \in G$, $U_h \in \mathbf{U}_h$ and $U_g \in \mathbf{U}_g$. Then

$$\|z_{h,g}(\varphi)\|^2 = 1 - |\langle U_h\varphi \mid U_g\varphi\rangle|^2 \leq d^2(S_h[D_\varphi], S_g[D_\varphi]);$$

where $D_\varphi = |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| \in \Pi_1(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of statement (1.9) in Theorem 1.1 of [11]; indeed that proof can be successfully carried out independently of the unitary or anti-unitary character of U_g or U_h.

Lemma 3.3. *Let G be a topological group, let $g \to S_g$ be a continuous mapping from G to the automorphisms of $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$, and let us fix an operator $U_g \in \mathbf{U}_g$ for each $g \in G$.*

[1] In fact Bargmann's continuity refers to a correspondence $g \to \mathbf{U}_g$ from a topological group G to the set of all *unitary* operator rays $\mathbf{U}_g$; but, since an operator ray can be bijectively identified with an automorphism of $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$, Bargmann's continuity can be reformulated in terms of automorphisms; this reformulation immediately extends to all automorphisms, included those corresponding to anti-unitary operator rays, through our Def. 3.2.

If $U_g\varphi_0$ is continuous in g as a function from G to $\mathcal{H}$ for a vector $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|\varphi_0\| = 1$, then $U_g\varphi_1$ is continuous in g for every fixed $\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|\varphi_1\| = 1$, such that $\varphi_1 \perp \varphi_0$.

Proof. We prove the lemma by adapting a part of the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [11]. Let us define $\varphi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\varphi_0 + \varphi_1)$; of course we have $\langle U_g\varphi_0 \mid U_g\varphi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ for all $g \in G$ independently of the unitary or anti-unitary character of $U_g \in \mathbf{U}_g$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle U_h\varphi_0 \mid z_{h,g}(\varphi)\rangle &= \langle U_h\varphi_0 - U_g\varphi_0 \mid U_g\varphi\rangle + \langle U_g\varphi_0 \mid U_g\varphi\rangle - \langle U_h\varphi \mid U_g\varphi\rangle\langle U_h\varphi_0 \mid U_h\varphi\rangle \\ &= \langle U_h\varphi_0 - U_g\varphi_0 \mid U_g\varphi\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 - \langle U_h\varphi \mid U_g\varphi\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

So

$$(1 - \langle U_h\varphi \mid U_g\varphi\rangle) = \sqrt{2}\,\{\langle U_h\varphi_0 \mid z_{h,g}(\varphi)\rangle + \langle U_g\varphi_0 - U_h\varphi_0 \mid U_g\varphi\rangle\}\ . \tag{18}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\|U_g\varphi - U_h\varphi\|^2 &= 2|\,\mathbb{R}\mathrm{e}(1 - \langle U_h\varphi \mid U_g\varphi\rangle)| \leq 2|1 - \langle U_h\varphi \mid U_g\varphi\rangle| \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{2}\{|\langle U_h\varphi_0 \mid z_{h,g}(\varphi)\rangle| + 2\sqrt{2}|U_g\varphi_0 - U_h\varphi_0 \mid U_g\varphi\rangle|\} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{2}\|\ \mid z_{h,g}(\varphi)\| + 2\sqrt{2}\|U_g\varphi_0 - U_h\varphi_0\| \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{2}\,(d(S_h[D_\varphi], S_g[D_\varphi]) + \|U_g\varphi_0 - U_h\varphi_0\|)\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where we made use of (18) in the second inequality, in the third inequality we used Schwarz inequality, and in the fourth inequality Lemma 3.2 is applied. These inequalities imply that $U_g\varphi$ is continuous in g; indeed, the distance $d(S_h[D_\varphi], S_g[D_\varphi])$ vanishes as $g \to h$ because the mapping $g \to S_g$ is continuous according to Def. 3.2 by the first continuity hypothesis; but also $\|U_g\varphi_0 - U_h\varphi_0\|$ vanishes as $g \to h$, because $U_g\varphi_0$ is continuous in g by the second continuity hypothesis.

Now, $\varphi_1 = \sqrt{2}\varphi - \varphi_0$, so that $U_g\varphi_1 = \sqrt{2}U_g\varphi_2 - U_g\varphi_0$ for all g such that U_g is unitary, but also for all g such that U_g is anti-unitary. Thus $U_g\varphi_1$ is continuous because $U_g\varphi$ and $U_g\varphi_1$ are continuous. •

Let us arbitrarily fix a vector $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, with $\|\varphi_0\| = 1$. Given any mapping $g \to S_g$ from a topological group G to the automorphisms of $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$, we define the real function $\rho_{\varphi_0} : G \to \mathbb{R}$, $\rho_{\varphi_0}(g) = Tr^{1/2}(D_{\varphi_0}S_g[D_{\varphi_0}])$. Since $S_g[D_{\varphi_0}] = \tilde{U}_g D_{\varphi_0}\tilde{U}_g^*$, where $\tilde{U}_g$ is any operator in $\mathbf{U}_g$, we have $\rho_{\varphi_0}(g) = |\langle\varphi_0 \mid \tilde{U}_g\varphi_0\rangle|$. Hence, $\langle\varphi_0 \mid \tilde{U}_g\varphi_0\rangle = e^{i\alpha(g)}|\langle\varphi_0 \mid \tilde{U}_g\varphi_0\rangle| = e^{i\alpha(g)}\rho_{\varphi_0}(g)$, for some $\alpha(g) \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\rho_{\varphi_0}(g) = |\langle\varphi_0 \mid \tilde{U}_g\varphi_0\rangle| = e^{-i\alpha(g)}\langle\varphi_0 \mid \tilde{U}_g\varphi_0\rangle$. Therefore, if for each $g \in G$ we choose $U_g = e^{-i\alpha(g)}\tilde{U}_g$ we obtain

$$\rho_{\varphi_0}(g) = \langle\varphi_0 \mid U_g\varphi_0\rangle\ ;\ \text{in particular,}\ \ U_e = \mathbb{1}\,. \tag{19}$$

Proposition 3.3. *Let G be a topological group, and let φ_0 be any fixed vector in $\mathcal{H}$ with $\|\varphi_0\| = 1$. Given a mapping $g \to S_g$ from G to the automorphisms of $\Pi(\mathcal{H})$, if each $g \in G$ is assigned the operator $U_g \in \mathbf{U}_g$ such that (19) holds, then $U_g\psi$ is continuous in g, whatever be the vector $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Bargmann proved that if $g \to S_g$ is continuous according to Def. 3.2 and if U_g is the operator such that (19) holds, then $U_g\varphi_0$ is continuous[2]. Now, let ψ be any vector of $\mathcal{H}$.

[2]In fact, Bargmann proved this statement for unitary U_g; but Bargmann's proof can be successfully carried out without assuming that all U_g are unitary.

If $\psi = 0$, then the continuity of $U_g\psi$ is obvious. Therefore it is sufficient to prove the proposition for $\psi \neq 0$.

If $\psi = \lambda\varphi_0$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, then we choose any $\varphi_1 \perp \varphi_0$, with $\|\varphi_1\| = 1$. According to Lemma 3.3, $U_g\varphi_1$ is continuous. The same Lemma implies that $U_g\frac{\psi}{\|\psi|}$ is continuous because $\frac{\psi}{\|\psi\|} \perp \varphi_1$. But $U_g\psi = \|\psi\|U_g\frac{\psi}{\|\psi\|}$ for all $g \in G$. Therefore $U_g\psi$ is continuous.

If $\psi \neq \lambda\varphi_0$, define $\varphi = \frac{\psi}{\|\psi\|}$; then a vector $\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ exists, with $\|\varphi_1\| = 1$ and $\varphi_1 \perp \varphi_0$, such that

$$\varphi = a\varphi_0 + b\varphi_1 \quad \text{where } a \in \mathbb{C} \text{ but } b \in \mathbb{R} \; . \tag{20}$$

Now, a real number r and a vector φ_2, with $\|\varphi_2\| = 1$ exist such that $a\varphi_0 = r\varphi_2$; this implies $\varphi_2 \perp \varphi_1$ and $\varphi = r\varphi_2 + b\varphi_1$. Lemma 3.3 implies that $U_g\varphi_1$ is continuous because $\varphi_1 \perp \varphi_0$; but the same Lemma implies that also $U_g\varphi_2$ is continuous, because $\varphi_2 \perp \varphi_1$. Therefore, since r and b are real numbers, $U_g\varphi = rU_g\varphi_2 + bU_g\varphi_1$ is continuous in g. Thus, $U_g\psi = \|\psi\|U_g\varphi$ is continuous too. •

Another condition with helpful implications is the unitary character of the operators U_g that realize the quantum transformations according to $S_g^\Sigma[A] = U_gAU_g^{-1}$. If the correspondence $g \to S_g^\Sigma$ satisfied $S_{g_1g_2}^\Sigma = S_{g_1}^\Sigma \circ S_{g_2}^\Sigma$ so that $g \to U_g$ would be a projective representation, then it could be easily proved, according to [3],[5],[9],[11], that every U_g must be unitary. But in presence of interaction $S_g^{\Sigma_1}$ can be different from $S_g^{\Sigma_2}$, so that only the more general statement (S.1) holds, and hence the unitary character of U_g cannot be implied by the cited proofs. Now we prove that anti-unitary U_g can be excluded under the only hypothesis that the correspondence $g \to S_g^\Sigma$ is continuous according to Def. 3.2.

Proposition 3.4. *If the mapping $g \to S_g^\Sigma$, that assigns each $g \in \Upsilon$ the quantum transformation of (3), is continuous according to Def. 3.2, then for every operator U_g such that $S_g^\Sigma[A] = U_gAU_g^*$ for all $A \in \Omega(\mathcal{H})$ is unitary.*

Proof. According to Prop. 3.3, for every $g \in \Upsilon$ a unitary or anti-unitary operator such that $S_g^\Sigma[A] = U_gAU_g^*$ exists which makes $U_g\psi$ continuous in g for all ψ. According to (19) $U_e = \mathbb{1}$ which is unitary. Hence, because of the continuity of $g \to U_g\psi$ for all ψ, a maximal neighborhood K_e of e must exist in Υ such that U_g is unitary for all $g \in K_e$; otherwise a sequence $g_n \to e$ would exist with U_{g_n} anti-unitary, so that $\langle\psi \mid \varphi\rangle = \langle U_{g_n}\varphi \mid U_{g_n}\psi\rangle$ for all $\psi, \varphi \in \mathcal{H}$, and then $\langle\psi \mid \varphi\rangle = \lim_{n\to\infty}\langle U_{g_n}\varphi \mid U_{g_n}\psi\rangle = \langle U_e\varphi \mid U_e\psi\rangle = \langle\varphi \mid \psi\rangle$. This last equality cannot hold for all $\psi, \varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ unless $\mathcal{H}$ is real.

Now we prove that such a neighborhood K_e has no boundary, and since Υ is a connected group, $K_e = \Upsilon$. If $g_0 \in \partial K_e$, two sequences $g_n \to g_0$ and $h_n \to g_0$ would exist with U_{g_n} unitary and U_{h_n} anti-unitary; therefore, the continuity of U_g would imply that U_{g_0} should simultaneously be unitary and anti-unitary. •

Remark 3.1. *The work of this subsection has shown that (S.2) and (S.3) imply that $S_g^\Sigma[A] = U_gAU_g^{-1}$, where U_g is unitary if $g \to S_g^\Sigma$ is continuous; as a consequence, the spectrum of any quantum observable is left unchanged by S_g^Σ.*

Such an invariance has important consequences; for instance, it entails that particular kinds of interactions are not compatible with the theory. Indeed, let the interaction be able to confine a localizable particle in a bounded region of the physical space. For sake of simplicity, we assume that space is one dimensional, so that there is only one

position operator Q whose possible values are confined by the interaction in the interval $[0, a]$ of the only axis of the reference frame Σ; this means that $[0, a]$ contains the spectrum of Q, of course: $\sigma(Q) \subseteq [0, a]$. Let $g \in \Upsilon$ be the spatial translation identified by $g(x) = x - a$. According to (2) we have $S_g^\Sigma[Q] = Q - a$, and hence $\sigma(S_g^\Sigma[Q]) \subseteq [-a, 0]$: S_g^Σ changes the spectrum of Q.

Therefore, if (S.2) and (S.3) were generally valid constraints, the confinement interaction should not be an interaction compatible with Quantum Theory, i.e. no interaction could sharply confine a particle within a bounded region. Such a drastic conclusion is based on (S.2) and (S.3) which, though endowed with conceptual soundness, do not have a formal derivation. For this reason we find appropriate, for the time being, to establish (S.2) and (S.3) as conditions which characterize the class of interactions investigated in the present work. In the following we shall see that such a class is a very large one, enough, in particular, to encompass electromagnetic interaction.

3.3 σ-conversions

In section 3.2 we have established, under a continuity condition for $g \to S_g^\Sigma$, that in the Quantum Theory of a physical system, also if it is not isolated, a continuous correspondence $U : \Upsilon \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ exists such that $S_g^\Sigma[A] = U_g A U_g^{-1}$. To assume that such a correspondence is a projective representation implies PROJ; therefore, according to section 2.4, the out-coming theory is unable to describe particles interacting with electromagnetic fields. So, we give up this condition with the scope of developing a Quantum Theory of an interacting particle empirically more adequate. But without such a "projectivity" condition Mackey's imprimitivity theorem does not apply. Hence, the development of our group-theoretical approach encounters a further obstacle. Now we address this obstacle.

The correspondence $g \to U_g$, can be *converted* into a continuous σ-representation if we multiply each operator U_g by a suitable unitary operator V_g of $\mathcal{H}$; namely, V_g is a unitary operator such that the correspondence $g \to \hat{U}_g = V_g U_g$ turns out to be a σ-representation. The transition from the correspondence $\{g \to U_g\}$ to $\{g \to \hat{U}_g = V_g U_g\}$ will be called *σ-conversion*; the mapping $V : \Upsilon \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$, $g \to V_g$ that realizes the σ-conversion will be called *σ-conversion mapping*. If $g \to V_g$ is a σ-conversion mapping for $g \to U_g$ and $\theta : \Upsilon \to \mathbb{R}$ is a real function, then also $g \to e^{i\theta(g)} V_g$ is a σ-conversion mapping, provided that $e^{i\theta(e)} = 1$. In any case, $V_e = \mathbb{1}$ must hold.

Since non-trivial projective representations of Υ exist,we can state the following proposition.

Proposition 3.5. *A correspondence $V : \Upsilon \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ always exists such that $\hat{U} : \Upsilon \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$, $g \to \hat{U}_g = V_g U_g$ is a non trivial projective representation.*

The σ-conversion allows to immediately identify a mathematical formalism for the Quantum Theory of the system, also in the case that the system is not isolated. In the case of a non-relativistic theory, where $\Upsilon = \mathcal{G}$, if $g \to V_g$ is a σ-conversion mapping for U_g then, according to (**MP.2**) in sect. 2.4, the σ-representation $g \to \hat{U}_g = V_g U_g$ has nine hermitean generators $\hat{P}_\alpha$, $\hat{J}_\alpha$, $\hat{G}_\alpha$ for which (9) hold. Then, following the argument of the proof of STAT in section 2.4, the common spectral measure of the triple $\mathbf{F} = \hat{\mathbf{G}}/\mu$ turns out to be an imprimitivity system for the restriction of $g \to \hat{U}_g$ to $\mathcal{E}$. So, by applying the imprimitivity theorem of Mackey [5], we can explicitly

identify $\mathcal{H}$ as $L_2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}_0)$, modulo unitary isomorphisms, where the operators F_α, $\hat{P}_\alpha$, $\hat{J}_\alpha$ and $\hat{G}_\alpha$ are explicitly specified according to

$$\mathcal{H} = L_2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}_0)\,, \qquad (F_\alpha\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = x_\alpha\psi(\mathbf{x})\,, \qquad \hat{P}_\alpha = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha}\,, \tag{21}$$

$$\hat{J}_\alpha = F_\beta\hat{P}_\gamma - F_\gamma\hat{P}_\beta + S_\alpha\,, \qquad \hat{G}_\alpha = \mu F_\alpha\,.$$

Here (α, β, γ) is a cyclic permutation of (1,2,3); the S_α are operators that act on $\mathcal{H}_0$ only, i.e. their action is $(S_\alpha\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{s}_\alpha\psi(\mathbf{x})$ where the $\hat{s}_\alpha$ are self-adjoint operators of $\mathcal{H}_0$ which form a representation of the commutation rules $[\hat{s}_\alpha, \hat{s}_\beta] = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\hat{s}_\gamma$. Since the reducibility of the inducing representation $L : SO(3) \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ implies the reducibility of $\hat{U} : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$, if $\hat{U}$ is irreducible then also $(\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_3)$ must be an irreducible representation of $[\hat{s}_\alpha, \hat{s}_\beta] = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\hat{s}_\gamma$; in this case, modulo unitary isomorphisms, $\mathcal{H}_0$ is one of the finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces $\mathbb{C}^{2s+1}$, with $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$: the $\hat{s}_\alpha$ are the familiar spin operators.

Hence, the mathematical formalism of the Quantum Theory of a localizable particle has been explicitly identified. However, the operators $\hat{U}_g$ concretely identified *are not* the unitary operators which realize the quantum transformations: given $g \in \mathcal{G}$, in general $S_g^\Sigma[A] = \hat{U}_g A \hat{U}_g^{-1}$ does not hold. As a consequence the operators $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1, Q_2, Q_3)$ representing the position cannot be identified following section 2.3 or the argument of the proof of Prop. 2.1. So, our explicit realization of the mathematical formalism of the theory would be, in general, devoid of physical significance.

Two tasks have to be accomplished in order that the formalism established by (21) becomes the mathematical formalism of the effective Quantum Theory of an interacting particle.

First, the operators $\mathbf{Q}$ of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L_2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}_0)$ in (21), that represent the position of the particle, should be explicitly determined. We address this task in section 3.4.

Second, the wave equation ruling over the time evolution should be determined. In section 3.5 we derive a general dynamical law. Specific wave equations corresponding to specific features of the interaction are determined in section 4.

3.4 Q-covariant σ-conversions

The position operators $\mathbf{Q}$ can be determined for those interactions that have the particular feature of admitting a σ-conversion $U_g \to \hat{U}_g = V_g U_g$ that *leaves unaltered the covariance properties of the position operators* $\mathbf{Q}$, i.e. such that

$$\hat{U}_g\mathbf{Q}\hat{U}_g^{-1} = \mathrm{g}(\mathbf{Q})\,,\ \forall g \in \mathcal{G}. \tag{22}$$

A σ-conversion satisfying (22) is said to be *Q-covariant*. Indeed, the following proposition hold.

Proposition 3.6. *If a σ-conversion for a particle yields an irreducible projective representation $\hat{U}$, then it is a Q-covariant σ-conversion if and only if the position operators $\mathbf{Q}$ coincide with $\mathbf{F}$.*

Proof. If $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{F} = \hat{\mathbf{G}}/\mu$, then (9) imply $\hat{U}_g\mathbf{Q}\hat{U}_g^{-1} \equiv \hat{U}_g\mathbf{F}\hat{U}_g^{-1} = \mathrm{g}(\mathbf{F}) = \mathrm{g}(\mathbf{Q})$.

Conversely, if $\hat{U} : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ is an irreducible projective representation obtained from $U : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ through a Q-covariant σ-conversion, then (22) for $\hat{U}_g = e^{i\hat{G}_\beta u} =$

$e^{i\mu F_\beta u}$ and (9.v) imply $[Q_\alpha - F_\alpha, F_\beta] = [Q_\alpha, F_\beta] - [F_\alpha, F_\beta] = \mathbb{0} - \mathbb{0} = \mathbb{0}$; therefore $(Q_\alpha - F_\alpha)\psi(\mathbf{x}) = (f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = f_\alpha(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x})$, where $f_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ is a self-adjoint operator of $\mathcal{H}_0$. However, the Q-covariance and (9.vi) imply also $[Q_\alpha - F_\alpha, \hat{P}_\beta] = [Q_\alpha, \hat{P}_\beta] - [Q_\alpha, \hat{P}_\beta] = i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{I} - i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{I} = \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $[f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}), \hat{P}_\beta] = \mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathbf{x}$; this relation, since $\hat{P} = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha}$, implies that $\frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_\alpha}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, for all α, β; therefore $f_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ is an operator $\hat{f}_\alpha$ of $\mathcal{H}_0$ which *does not depend* on $\mathbf{x}$. Now, since $\hat{f}_\alpha = Q_\alpha - F_\alpha$, also $[\hat{f}_\alpha, \hat{f}_\beta] = \mathbf{0}$ holds; moreover, from (2.i) for a pure spatial rotation g about x_α and from (9.iv) we obtain $[\hat{J}_\alpha, Q_\beta - F_\beta] = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(Q_\gamma - F_\gamma) = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\hat{f}_\gamma$; but the irreducibility of $\hat{U}$ implies the irreducibility of the inducing projective representation $L : SO(3) \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_0)$, so that $\mathcal{H}_0$ is finite dimensional; then $[\hat{f}_\alpha, \hat{f}_\beta] = \mathbf{0}$ and $[\hat{J}_\alpha, \hat{f}_\beta] = i\hat{\epsilon}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\hat{f}_\gamma$ can hold only if $\hat{f}_\alpha = \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $F_\alpha = Q_\alpha$. •

Hence, in the Quantum Theory of an interacting particle, where $\hat{U}$ is irreducible, the multiplication operators can be identified with the position operators if and only if the interaction has the particular regularity feature of admitting a σ-conversion which preserves the covariance properties of the position operators.

Following a customary habit, we say that a particle, whose interaction admits Q-covariant σ-conversion, is *elementary* if $\hat{U}$ is irreducible.

The following proposition specify how in the Quantum Theory of an elementary particle each $\hat{U}_g$ is related to the unitary operator U_g that realizes the quantum transformation corresponding to g.

Proposition 3.7. *For every $g \in \mathcal{G}$, the operator V_g of a Q-covariant σ-conversion has the form $(V_g\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = \left(e^{i\theta(g,\mathbf{Q})}\psi\right)(\mathbf{x}) = e^{i\theta(g,\mathbf{x})}\psi(\mathbf{x})$, where $\theta(g,\mathbf{x})$ is a self-adjoint operator of $\mathcal{H}_0$ which depends on $\mathbf{x}$ and on g.*

Proof. Relations(22) and (2) imply $V_g U_g \mathbf{Q} U_g^{-1} V_g^{-1} = \mathsf{g}(\mathbf{Q})$, which implies $V_g(\mathsf{g}(\mathbf{Q}))V_g^{-1} = \mathsf{g}(\mathbf{Q})$, i.e. $[V_g, \mathsf{g}(\mathbf{Q})] = \mathbb{0}$. Then $[V_g, \mathsf{f}(\mathsf{g}(\mathbf{Q}))] = \mathbb{0}$ for every sufficiently regular function f; by taking $\mathsf{f} = \mathsf{g}^{-1}$ we have $[V_g, \mathbf{Q}] = \mathbf{0}$. Then $(V_g\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = \mathsf{h}_g(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathsf{h}_g(\mathbf{x})$ is an operator of $\mathcal{H}_0$. Finally, the unitary character of V_g imposes that $h_g(\mathbf{x})$ must be unitary as an operator of $\mathcal{H}_0$; thus a self-adjoint operator $\theta(g,\mathbf{x})$ of $\mathcal{H}_0$ exists such that $\mathsf{h}_g(\mathbf{x}) = e^{\theta(g,\mathbf{x})}$. •

If $g \to S_g^\Sigma$ is continuous according to Def. 3.2, then $g \to V_g$ must be continuous because $g \to \hat{U}_g = V_g U_g$ is continuous.

Remark 3.2. *In the present approach the imprimitivity system for applying Mackey's theorem is identified within the abstract projective representation itself, namely it is the PV spectral measure of $\hat{\mathbf{G}}/\mu$. This is a remarkable difference with respect to the past approaches, e.g. Mackey's approach, where the imprimitivity system is identified as the PV measure of the position operators.*

3.5 General Dynamical law

Now we derive a general dynamical equation ruling over the time evolution of an elementary particle. In so doing we shall suppose that the σ-conversion mapping $g \to V_g$ is differentiable with respect to the parameters $a_\alpha, \theta_\alpha, u_\alpha$ of the group $\mathcal{G}$.

Let us consider the pure velocity boost $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\hat{U}_g = e^{i\hat{G}_\alpha u}$. According to sect. 3.3, the formalism of its Quantum Theory can be identified with that established

by (21). Since $\hat{G}_\alpha = \mu F_\alpha = \mu Q_\alpha$, we can write $\hat{U}_g = e^{i\mu Q_\alpha u}$; therefore

$$\hat{U}_g \dot{Q}_\beta \hat{U}_g^{-1} = \dot{Q}_\beta + i\mu[Q_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta]u + o_1(u). \tag{23}$$

On the other hand,

$$\hat{U}_g \dot{Q}_\beta \hat{U}_g^{-1} = \lim_{t\to 0} V_g U_g \frac{(Q_\beta^{(t)} - Q_\beta)}{t} U_g^{-1} V_g^{-1}. \tag{24}$$

By making use of $U_g Q_\beta^{(t)} U_g^{-1} = Q_\beta^{(t)} - \delta_{\alpha\beta} u t \mathbb{I}$, implied by (2), and of Prop. 3.2, Prop. 3.3 in (24), and then comparing with (23) we obtain

$$\hat{U}_g \dot{Q}_\beta \hat{U}_g^{-1} = V_g \dot{Q}_\beta V_g^{-1} - \delta_{\alpha\beta} u \mathbb{I} = \dot{Q}_\beta + i\mu[Q_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta]u + o_1(u). \tag{25}$$

But Prop. 3.7 implies that $V_g = e^{i\varsigma_\alpha(u,\mathbf{Q})}$, where $\varsigma_\alpha(u, \mathbf{x})$ is a self-adjoint operator of $\mathcal{H}_0$; replacing in (25) we obtain

$$\dot{Q}_\beta + i[\varsigma_\alpha(u, \mathbf{Q}), \dot{Q}_\beta] + o_2(u) - \delta_{\alpha\beta} u \mathbb{I} = \dot{Q}_\beta + i\mu[Q_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta]u + o_1(u). \tag{26}$$

Since $e^{i\varsigma_\alpha(0,\mathbf{Q})} = \mathbb{I}$, the expansion of ς_α with respect to u yields $\varsigma_\alpha(u, \mathbf{Q}) = \frac{\partial \varsigma_\alpha}{\partial u}(0, \mathbf{Q})u + o_3(u)$; by replacing this last relation in (26) we obtain

$$\mu[Q_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta] = [\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}), \dot{Q}_\beta] + i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{I},$$

where $\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) = \frac{\partial \varsigma_\alpha}{\partial u}(0, \mathbf{Q})$. By replacing $\dot{Q}_\beta = i[H, Q_\beta]$ in this last equation we can apply Jacobi's identity, and in so doing we obtain $[Q_\beta, \mu\dot{Q}_\alpha] = [Q_\beta, \dot{\eta}_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})] + i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{I}$, i.e.

$$[Q_\beta, \dot{\eta}_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) - \mu\dot{Q}_\alpha] = -i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{I} = [Q_\beta, -\hat{P}_\alpha].$$

Hence $[\dot{\eta}_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) - \mu\dot{Q}_\alpha - \hat{P}_\alpha, Q_\beta] = \mathbf{0}$, from which we imply that for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ an operator $f_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ of $\mathcal{H}_0$, must exist such that the equation $\{\dot{\eta}(\mathbf{Q}) - \mu\dot{Q}_\alpha + \hat{P}_\alpha\}\psi(\mathbf{x}) = f_\alpha(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x})$ holds, that we can rewrite as

$$i[H, \mu Q_\alpha - \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})] = \hat{P}_\alpha - f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}). \tag{27}$$

This is a general dynamical equation for a localizable particle whose interaction admits Q-covariant σ-conversions; according to such a law, the effects of the interaction on the dynamics are encoded in the six "fields" η_α, f_α.

3.6 Electromagnetic interaction for spin-0 particles

Once derived the general dynamical law (27) for an elementary particle with homogeneous in time interaction, it is worth to re-discover the wave equation currently adopted in quantum physics as a particular case of the general equation (27). In this subsection we do this for a spin-0 particle, for which $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{C}$ so that $\mathcal{H} = L_2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. The nowadays adopted Schroedinger equation for a spin-0 particle has the form

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\psi_t = \left\{ \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} [\hat{P}_\alpha + a_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})]^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q}) \right\} \psi_t, \tag{28}$$

i.e. the Hamiltonian operator is $H = (1/2\mu)\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\{\hat{P}_\alpha + a_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})\}^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q})$, where $a_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})$ and $\Phi(\mathbf{Q})$ are self-adjoint operators of $L_2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ functions of $\mathbf{Q}$. Now we show that within our approach this specific Quantum Theory bi-univocally corresponds to the case that the functions η_α in the general law (27) are constant functions multiple of $\mathbb{1}$.

Proposition 3.8. *The hamiltonian operator H of an interacting spin-0 particle which admits Q-covariant σ-conversion has the form $H = (1/2\mu)\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\{\hat{P}_\alpha + a_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})\}^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q})$ if and only if the functions η_α in (27) are constant functions. In this case $a_\alpha = -f_\alpha$.*

Proof. If η_α is a constant function, then (27) transforms into $i[H, \mu Q_\alpha] = \hat{P}_\alpha - f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})$ which holds if $H_0 = \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\{\hat{P}_\alpha - f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})\}^2$ replaces H. Hence the operator $H - H_0$ must be a function Φ of $\mathbf{Q}$ because of the completeness of $\mathbf{Q}$. Then $\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) = c_\alpha \mathbb{1}$ implies $H = \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}[\hat{P}_\alpha - f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})]^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q})$.

Now we prove the converse. Let us suppose that $H = \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\{\hat{P}_\alpha + a_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})\}^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q})$; by replacing this H in (27) we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&i[H, \mu Q_\alpha - \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})] = \hat{P}_\alpha - f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) = \\
&= \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta^2, \mu Q_\alpha] + \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [a_\beta \hat{P}_\beta, \mu Q_\alpha] + \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta a_\beta, \mu Q_\alpha] + \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [a_\beta^2, \mu Q_\alpha] + \\
&\quad -\frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta^2, \eta_\alpha] - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [a_\beta \hat{P}_\beta, \eta_\alpha] - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta a_\beta, \eta_\alpha] - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [a_\beta^2, \eta_\alpha] + \\
&\quad + i[\Phi(\mathbf{Q}), \mu Q_\alpha - \eta_\alpha].
\end{aligned}
$$

In the last member of these equalities, the fourth, the eighth and the last term are zero. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&i[H, \mu Q_\alpha - \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})] = \hat{P}_\alpha - f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) \qquad (29)\\
&= \hat{P}_\alpha + \frac{i}{2}\sum_\beta (a_\beta \hat{P}_\beta Q_\alpha - Q_\alpha a_\beta \hat{P}_\beta + \hat{P}_\beta a_\beta Q_\alpha - Q_\alpha \hat{P}_\beta a_\beta) + \\
&\quad -\frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta^2, \eta_\alpha] - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta (a_\beta \hat{P}_\beta \eta_\alpha - \eta_\alpha a_\beta \hat{P}_\beta + \hat{P}_\beta a_\beta \eta_\alpha - \eta_\alpha \hat{P}_\beta a_\beta) \\
&= \hat{P}_\alpha + \frac{i}{2}\sum_\beta (a_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta, Q_\alpha] + [\hat{P}_\beta, Q_\alpha] a_\beta) - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta^2, \eta_\alpha] \\
&\quad -\frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta (a_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta, \eta_\alpha] + [\hat{P}_\beta, \eta_\alpha] a_\beta) \\
&= \hat{P}_\alpha + \frac{i}{2}(-2i a_\alpha) - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta^2, \eta_\alpha] - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta \left(-2i\, a_\beta \frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta}\right) \\
&= \hat{P}_\alpha + a_\alpha - \frac{1}{\mu}\sum_\beta a_\beta \frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta} - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum [\hat{P}_\beta^2, \eta_\alpha].
\end{aligned}
$$

From the second and last members of this equations' chain we obtain $-f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) = a_\alpha - \frac{1}{\mu}\sum_\beta a_\beta \frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta} - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum [\hat{P}_\beta^2, \eta_\alpha]$, which implies that $\sum_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta^2, \eta_\alpha]$ is a function of $\mathbf{Q}$. Therefore

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta^2, \eta_\alpha] = \phi_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) &= \sum_\beta (\hat{P}_\beta [\hat{P}_\beta, \eta_\alpha] + [\hat{P}_\beta, \eta_\alpha]\hat{P}_\beta) = (-i)\sum_\beta \left(\hat{P}_\beta \frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta} + \frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta}\hat{P}_\beta\right) \\ &= (-i)\sum_\beta \left(\left[\hat{P}_\beta, \frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta}\right] + 2\frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta}\hat{P}_\beta\right) \\ &= (-i)\sum_\beta \left((-i)\frac{\partial^2 \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta^2} + 2\frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta}\hat{P}_\beta\right).\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence $\sum_\beta \frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta}\hat{P}_\beta$ must be a function of $\mathbf{Q}$, so that for every γ $\sum_\beta \left[Q_\gamma, \frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\beta}\hat{P}_\beta\right] = \mathbb{0} = \frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\gamma}[Q_\gamma, \hat{P}_\gamma] = i\frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\gamma}$; therefore $\frac{\partial \eta_\alpha}{\partial q_\gamma} = \mathbb{0}$; thus η_α is a constant function. By using this result in the equality between the second and the last members of (29) we obtain $a_\alpha = f_\alpha$. •

4 Implying wave equations

According to section 3.6, for a spin-0 particle the interaction described by (28), which encompasses the electromagnetic interaction, is determined by the fact that each operator $\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})$ appearing in the general dynamical law (27) is a real multiple of the identity operator: $\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) = \lambda_\alpha \mathbb{1}$, with $\lambda_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, according to Prop. 3.7, $e^{i\hat{G}_\alpha u} = V_g U_g = e^{i\varsigma(u,\mathbf{Q})}U_g = e^{i\{\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})u + o_\alpha(u,\mathbf{Q})\}}U_g = e^{i\lambda_\alpha u}e^{io_\alpha(u,\mathbf{Q})}U_g$, where $o_\alpha(u,\mathbf{Q})$ is an operator infinitesimal of order grater than 1 in u with respect to the topology of $\mathcal{H}$, so that $e^{i\hat{G}_\alpha u}Q_\beta^{(t)}e^{-i\hat{G}_\alpha u} = e^{io_\alpha(u,\mathbf{Q})}U_g Q_\beta^{(t)} U_g^{-1} e^{-io_\alpha(u,\mathbf{Q})} = e^{io_\alpha(u,\mathbf{Q})}S_g[Q_\beta^{(t)}]e^{-io_\alpha(u,\mathbf{Q})} = \{\mathbf{1}+\omega_1(u,\mathbf{Q})\}S_g[Q_\beta^{(t)}]\{\mathbf{1}+\omega_2(u,\mathbf{Q})\}$, where $\omega_k(u,\mathbf{Q})$ is an operator infinitesimal of order grater than 1 in u. Therefore, the σ-conversion leaves invariant the transformation properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ with respect to galileian boosts at the first order in u.

This result suggests that several possible specific forms of the wave equation, i.e. of the hamiltonian operator H, could be similarly determined by this kind of invariance with respect to specific subgroups of $\mathcal{G}$, also for arbitrary values of the spin.

In fact, this is the case. In this section we shall identify which specific form the hamiltonian H must take as a consequence of the fact that the covariance properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ with respect to specific subgroups of $\mathcal{G}$ are left unaltered at the first order by the σ-conversion admitted by the interaction. In section 4.1 we address the case that such a subgroup is the subgroup of boosts, for every value of the spin. In section 4.2 we address the task for the subgroup of spatial translations.

4.1 Invariance under galileian boosts

The covariance properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ with respect galileian boosts g are expressed by $S_g[Q_\beta^{(t)}] = U_g Q_\beta^{(t)} U_g^{-1} = Q_\beta^{(t)} - \delta_{\alpha\beta} ut\mathbb{1}$; therefore the equality

$$e^{i\hat{G}_\alpha u}Q_\beta^{(t)}e^{-i\hat{G}_\alpha u} = Q_\beta^{(t)} - \delta_{\alpha\beta}ut\mathbb{1} + o_1^{(t)}(u), \tag{30}$$

where $o_1^{(t)}(u)$ is an operator infinitesimal of order greater than 1 with respect to u, is the necessary and sufficient condition in order that the σ-conversion leave unaltered

the covariance properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ with respect to the Galileian boosts, at the first order in u.

Proposition 4.1. *A Q-covariant σ-conversion leaves unaltered the covariance properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ under galileian boosts at the first order in the boosts' velocity if an only if*

$$[\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}), Q_\beta^{(t)}] = \mathcal{O}\,. \tag{31}$$

If (31) holds, then the following relations must hold.

$$(i)\quad [\hat{G}_\alpha, Q_\beta^{(t)}] = i\delta_{\alpha\beta}t\ , \qquad (ii)\quad [\hat{G}_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta] = i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\,; \tag{32}$$

$$(i)\quad \mu Q_\beta^{(t)} - \hat{P}_\beta t = \varphi_\beta^{(t)}(\mathbf{Q})\ , (ii)\quad \dot{Q}_\beta = \frac{1}{\mu}\left(\hat{P}_\beta + a_\beta(\mathbf{Q})\right), \tag{33}$$

where $\varphi_\beta^{(t)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $a_\beta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{d}{dt}\varphi_\beta^{(t)}(\mathbf{x})\mid_{t=0}$ are self-adjoint operators of $\mathcal{H}_0$.

Proof. Let $\hat{U}_g = e^{i\hat{G}_\alpha u} = V_g U_g$ be the σ-converted unitary operator associated with the galileian boost g, where $V_g = e^{i\varsigma_\alpha(u,\mathbf{Q})}$ according to Prop. 3.7. By starting from (30) and by expanding $e^{\pm i\varsigma_\alpha(u,\mathbf{Q})}$ with respect to u we obtain

$$e^{i\hat{G}_\alpha u}Q_\beta^{(t)}e^{-i\hat{G}_\alpha u} = V_g U_g Q_\beta^{(t)} U_g^{-1}V_g^{-1} = Q_\beta^{(t)} + i[\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}), Q_\beta^{(t)}]u - \delta_{\alpha\beta}ut\mathbb{1} + o_2^{(t)}(u). \tag{34}$$

The comparison with (30) show that such a condition holds if and only if (31) holds.

By expanding $e^{\pm i\hat{G}_\alpha u}$ with respect to u we find $e^{i\hat{G}_\alpha u}Q_\beta^{(t)}e^{-i\hat{G}_\alpha u} = Q_\beta^{(t)} + i[\hat{G}_\alpha, Q_\beta^{(t)}]u + o_3^{(t)}(u)$, so that (30) holds if and only if $i[\hat{G}_\alpha, Q_\beta^{(t)}] = -\delta_{\alpha\beta}t\mathbb{1}$; therefore (32) hold. Finally, since $\hat{G}_\alpha = \mu Q_\alpha$, (32.i) implies $[\mu Q_\alpha, Q_\beta^{(t)}] = [\hat{G}_\alpha, Q_\beta^{(t)}] = [Q_\alpha, \hat{P}_\beta]t$, and then a self-adjoint operator $\varphi_\beta^{(t)}$ of $\mathcal{H}_0$ must exists for every $\mathbf{x}$ such that (33) hold. •

If we put $H_0 = \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\gamma \left(\hat{P}_\gamma + a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q})\right)^2$, then a simple calculation yields $i[H_0, Q_\beta] = \frac{1}{\mu}\left(\hat{P}_\beta + a_\beta(\mathbf{Q})\right)$. Whenever (31) holds, Prop. 4.1 implies $i[H_0, Q_\beta] = \dot{Q}_\beta$, i.e. $[H, Q_\beta] = [H_0, Q_\beta]$; therefore

$$H = H_0 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q}) = \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\gamma \left(\hat{P}_\gamma + a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q})\right)^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q}), \tag{35}$$

where $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ is a self-adjoint operator of $\mathcal{H}_0$. Then the wave equation is

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\psi_t = \left\{\frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\gamma \left(\hat{P}_\gamma + a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q})\right)^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q})\right\}\psi_t.$$

According to (35), the dynamics of the particle is determined by the four vector valued functions a_α, Φ. We can call them the "fields" which describe the effects of the interaction; in so doing, however we have not confuse them with other notions of field involved in Quantum Physics. Now we shall see how these fields are related to the fields η_α, f_α entering the general dynamical law (27).

From (33.ii) we imply $[\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}), \dot{Q}_\beta] = \frac{1}{\mu}[\eta(\mathbf{Q}), \hat{P}_\beta] + \frac{1}{\mu}[\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}), a_\beta(\mathbf{Q})]$. By making use of (31) we obtain

$$\frac{\partial\eta_\alpha}{\partial x_\beta}(\mathbf{Q}) = \frac{i}{2}[\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}), a_\beta(\mathbf{Q})]\,. \tag{36.i}$$

Now, by replacing the form (35) of H in (27) we obtain

$$\hat{P}_\alpha - f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) = i[H, \mu Q_\alpha - \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})] \tag{37}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= i\left[\frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\beta \mu^2 \dot{Q}_\beta^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q}), \mu Q_\alpha\right] - i\left[\frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\beta \mu^2 \dot{Q}_\beta^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q}), \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})\right] \\ &= i\left\{\frac{1}{2}\mu\sum_\beta [\dot{Q}_\beta^2, \mu Q_\alpha] + [\Phi(\mathbf{Q}), \mu Q_\alpha]\right\} + \\ &\quad -i\left\{\frac{1}{2}\mu\sum_\beta [\dot{Q}_\beta^2, \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})] + [\Phi(\mathbf{Q}), \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By making use of (32.ii), which implies $[\mu Q_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta^2] = 2i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\dot{Q}_\beta$, of (31) and of (33.ii), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}_\alpha - f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) &= \frac{1}{2}\mu\sum_\beta(-2i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\dot{Q}_\beta) + \mathbb{0} - \frac{i}{2}\mu\mathbb{0} - i[\Phi(\mathbf{Q}), \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})] \\ &= \mu\dot{Q}_\alpha - i[\Phi(\mathbf{Q}), \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})] = \hat{P}_\alpha + a_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) - i[\Phi(\mathbf{Q}), \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})] = \hat{P}_\alpha - f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have proved that

$$f_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) = i[\Phi(\mathbf{Q}), \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})] - a_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}). \tag{36.ii}$$

Hence, whenever (31) holds, the fields η_α and f_α in the general law (27) are determined, according to (36), by the fields a_α, Φ.

For the particular case of a spin-0 particle we can show the following further characterization.

Proposition 4.2. *In the simplest quantum Theory of an interacting particle, corresponding to the case $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{C}$ in (21), the Q-covariant σ-conversions for which $\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}) =$ constant are those and only those which leave unaltered the covariant properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ with respect to the Galileian boosts $g \in \mathcal{G}$, at the first order in the boost's velocity.*

Proof. If $\eta_\alpha =$constant then (31) holds, of course. Therefore, in order to prove the proposition, it is sufficient to prove the inverse implication. Hence we suppose that (31) holds. It implies the condition $[\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}), Q_\alpha] = \mathbb{0}$. On the other hand, (33.i) implies $Q_\beta^{(t)} = \frac{t}{\mu}\left(\varphi_\beta^{(t)}(\mathbf{Q}) + \hat{P}_\beta\right)$, which replaced in (31) yields $[\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}), \hat{P}_\beta] = \mathbb{0}$; therefore $\eta_\alpha(\mathbf{Q})$ is a constant operator $\lambda_\alpha \mathbb{1}$. •

4.2 Invariance under spatial translations

Let us now suppose that the interaction admits a Q-covariant σ-conversion such that if $\hat{U}_g = e^{-i\hat{P}_\alpha a}$ then

$$e^{-i\hat{P}_\alpha a} Q_\beta^{(t)} e^{i\hat{P}_\alpha a} = Q_\beta^{(t)} - \delta_{\alpha\beta} + o_1^{(t)}(a), \tag{38}$$

where $o_1^{(t)}(a)$ is an infinetisimal operator of order greater than 1 in a. In fact, we are supposing that the interaction leaves unaltered the covariance properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ with respect to spatial translations at the first order in the translation parameter a. Now, by expanding $e^{-i\hat{P}_\alpha a}$ with respect to the translation parameter a, (38) yields

$$(i)\quad [Q_\beta^{(t)}, \hat{P}_\alpha] = i\delta_{\alpha\beta} \qquad \text{which implies} \qquad (ii)\quad [\dot{Q}_\beta, \hat{P}_\alpha] = \mathbb{0}. \tag{39}$$

Therefore we can state that

$$\dot{Q}_\beta = v_\beta(\hat{\mathbf{P}}), \tag{40}$$

where $v_\beta(\mathbf{p})$ is a self-adjoint operator of $\mathcal{H}_0$. Since $[Q_\alpha, v_\beta(\hat{\mathbf{P}})] = i\frac{\partial v_\beta}{\partial p_\alpha}(\hat{\mathbf{P}})$, by making use of the Jacobi identity for $[Q_\alpha, [H, Q_\beta]]$ we obtain

$$i\frac{\partial v_\beta}{\partial p_\alpha}(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) = [Q_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\beta] = i\,[Q_\alpha, [H, Q_\beta]] = [Q_\beta, \dot{Q}_\alpha] = i\frac{\partial v_\alpha}{\partial p_\beta}(\hat{\mathbf{P}}).$$

This equality shows that $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}) = (v_1(\mathbf{p}), v_2(\mathbf{p}), v_3(\mathbf{p}))$ is an irrotational field; hence a function F of $\mathbf{p}$ exists such that $v_\alpha(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_\alpha}(\mathbf{p})$, where $F(\mathbf{p})$ is a self-adjoint operator of $\mathcal{H}_0$. Therefore we can establish the following equalities.

$$\dot{Q}_\alpha = v_\alpha(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) = \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_\alpha}(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) = i[F(\hat{\mathbf{P}}), Q_\alpha] = i[H, Q_\alpha]. \tag{41}$$

The last equation implies that a function Ψ of $\mathbf{x}$ exists such that $H - F(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) = \Psi(\hat{\mathbf{Q}})$, i.e.

$$H = F(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) + \Psi(\mathbf{Q}), \tag{42}$$

where $\Psi(\mathbf{x})$ is a self-adjoint operator of $\mathcal{H}_0$. Then the wave equation is

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\psi_t = \left\{F(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) + \Psi(\mathbf{Q})\right\}\psi_t.$$

4.3 Invariance under both

Let us suppose that the interaction admits a σ-conversion that leaves unaltered the covariance properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ under both subgroups of boosts and of spatial translations. Accordingly, the following equality holds

$$\begin{aligned} H &= F(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) + \Psi(\mathbf{Q}) = \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\gamma \left(\hat{P}_\gamma + a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q})\right)^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\gamma \left(\hat{P}_\gamma^2 + a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q})\hat{P}_\gamma + \hat{P}_\gamma a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q}) + a_\gamma^2(\mathbf{Q})\right) + \Phi(\mathbf{Q}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q})\hat{P}_\gamma + \hat{P}_\gamma a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q}) = [a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q}), \hat{P}_\gamma] + 2a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q})\hat{P}_\gamma = i\frac{\partial a_\gamma}{\partial x_\gamma}(\mathbf{Q}) + 2a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q})\hat{P}_\gamma$ the equality above implies

$$\frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\beta \hat{P}_\beta a_\beta(\mathbf{Q}) = \left(F(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) - \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\beta \hat{P}_\beta^2\right) + \Psi(\mathbf{Q}) - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta \frac{\partial a_\beta}{\partial x_\beta}(\mathbf{Q}) - \Phi(\mathbf{Q}) - \sum_\beta a_\beta^2(\mathbf{Q})\,.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\beta \hat{P}_\beta a_\beta(\mathbf{Q}) = F_1(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) + F_2(\mathbf{Q}),$$

where $F_1(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) = \left(F(\hat{\mathbf{P}}) - \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\beta \hat{P}_\beta^2\right)$ and $F_2(\mathbf{Q}) = \Psi(\mathbf{Q}) - \frac{i}{2\mu}\sum_\beta \frac{\partial a_\beta}{\partial x_\beta}(\mathbf{Q}) - \Phi(\mathbf{Q}) - \sum_\beta a_\beta^2(\mathbf{Q})$. Therefore

$$\left[Q_\gamma, \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\beta \hat{P}_\beta a_\beta(\mathbf{Q})\right] = \frac{i}{2\mu}a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q}) = \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_\gamma}(\hat{\mathbf{P}}).$$

Then

$$[\hat{P}_\alpha, a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q}] = \frac{\partial a_\gamma}{\partial x_\alpha}(\mathbf{Q}) = -2i\mu\left[\hat{P}_\alpha, \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_\gamma}(\hat{\mathbf{P}})\right] = \mathbb{0}.$$

Therefore, $a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q})$ is an operator that acts as follows

$$\left(a_\gamma(\mathbf{Q})\psi\right)(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{a}_\gamma\psi(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $\hat{a}_\gamma$ is an operator of $\mathcal{H}_0$ which does not depend on $\mathbf{x}$.

Thus, if (31) and (38) hold, then $H = \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\gamma(\hat{P}_\gamma + \hat{a}_\gamma)^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q})$, and the wave equation is

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\psi_t = \left\{\frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_\gamma(\hat{P}_\gamma + \hat{a}_\gamma)^2 + \Phi(\mathbf{Q})\right\}\psi_t\,., \tag{43}$$

In the spin-0 case, it is straightforward to show that if the σ-conversion leaves unaltered also the covariance properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ with respect to the rotations subgroup, then $a_\gamma = 0$.

4.4 Conclusive remarks

Our work has been successful in deriving the known forms (35) and (43) of the non relativistic wave equation of an interacting particle, by implying them through a deductive development. However, the present approach does not exclude the possibility of wave equations, and hence of interactions, different from the known ones.

In fact, the existence of interactions besides those described by equations (35) and (43) is manifestly required by the phenomenological reality. It is sufficient to recall that (35) describes, in its classical limit, only *approximately* the motion of a charged particle in an electromagnetic field; the approximation consists in neglecting the effect of the radiation caused by the acceleration of the charge on the motion of the particle. Actually, (35) can be considered valid only for particles *slowly* accelerated by the electromagnetic field. Since the occurrence of phenomena with *strongly* accelerated particles cannot be excluded, a non approximated wave equation must be different from (35) and from (43). According to our approach this implies that the corresponding σ-conversion cannot leave unaltered the covariance properties of $\mathbf{Q}^{(t)}$ with respect to the subgroup of boosts.

Therefore our development opens to the possibility for interactions different form those described by (35) and (43). The present work has a general character, and these possibilities have not been specifically explored; however, the present theoretical framework allows for such an investigation. This possibility is precluded by the other practiced methods for quantizing the interaction; for instance the methods based on the gauge principle – without entering Quantum Field Theories – immediately lead to wave equations of the form (35). On the other hand, the method of canonical quantization is constitutionally constrained to the wave equations implied by the classical equations.

The author is convinced that interesting results of the approach can be found by extending it to a relativistic theory. Such an extension is in progress.

References

[1] Wigner E P 1959 *Group Theory and its Applications to the Quantum Theory of Atomic Spectra* (Boston: Academic Press)

[2] Cassinelli G, De Vito E, Lahti P, Levrero A 1997 *Rev.Math.Phys.* **8** 921

[3] Mackey G W 1968 *Induced Representations of Group and Quantum Mechanics* (New York: W.A Benjamin Inc.)

[4] Mackey, G W 1958 *Acta Mathematica* **99** 265

[5] Mackey G W 1989 *Unitary Representations in Physics, Probability and Number Theory* (Reading: Addison Wesley Pub.Co.)

[6] Ekstein H 1967 *Phys. Rev.* **153** 1397

[7] Jauch J M 1968 *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Reading: Addison Wesley Pub.Co.)

[8] Mackey G W 1993 *Int.J.Th.Phys* **32** 1643

[9] Simon B 1976 in *Studies in Mathematical Physics: Essays in Honor of Valentine Bargmann* ed Lieb E H, Simon B and Wightman A S (Princeton: Princeton Un. Press) pp. 327-350

[10] Nisticò G 2016 *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **670** 012039

[11] Bargmann V 1954 *Ann. of Math.* **59** 1

[12] Jordan T F 1975 *Am. J. Phys.* **43** 1089

[13] Ballentine L E 2006 *Quantum Mechanics - A Modern Development* (Singapore: World Scientific)

[14] Molnár L 2007 *Lecture Notes in Matemathics* **1895** (Berlin: Springer)

[15] Wigner E 1939 *Ann. of Math.* **40** 149